



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

12. Present.
13. Elbow your pipe.
14. Mouth your pipe.
15. Give fire.
16. Nose your Tobacco.
17. Puffe up your smoake.
18. Spit on your right hand.
19. Throw off your loose ashes.
20. Present to your friend.
21. As you were.
22. Clense your pipe.
23. Blow your pipe.
24. Supply your pipe.

## II.

*The Launching of the Mary; or The Seaman's Honest Wife*, is a manuscript play preserved in the British Museum.<sup>7</sup> It is contained in ms. *Egerton* 1994, a collection of fourteen manuscripts bound together and labelled *English Plays of the XVII Century*. *The Launching of the Mary* is number fourteen, occupying ff. 317-349, inclusive. It is written in a large fair hand. Apparently it is the first draught, written at different times, with different inks, and on different paper. Moreover, the manuscript is full of the author's corrections. Folio 317 has simply the words "Anno 1632"; f. 318, recto, contains the title and the *dramatis personæ*; verso, the prologue; ff. 319-349, the body of the play; f. 349, verso, besides the concluding (nine) lines of the play, has the epilogue, and the permission to act the play.

This play, called ye Seamen's Honest wife, all ye oathes left out in ye action as they are crosst in ye book and all other Reformatiōs strictly observ'd, may bee acted, not otherwyse. This 27 June, 1633.

HENRY HERBERT.

I command your Bookekeeper to present me with a faire Copy hereafter and to leave out all oathes, prophaness and publick Ribaldry, as he will answer it at his peril.

HERBERT.

Clews to the authorship of the play are found in the title, *The Lanchinge of the Mary written by W. M. gent in his returne from East India. Ad. 1632*, (the Prologue states further, "This was done at sea"); and in the fact that the play is

little more or less than a eulogy of the East India Company.

The author was probably William Methold (d. 1653). He entered the service of the East India Company in 1615, and was rapidly promoted. That he was familiar with the pen is shown by the fact that in 1626 he contributed to the fifth volume of *Purchas's Pilgrimes*, a narrative entitled *Relations of the Kingdome of Golchonda and other neighbouring Nations within the Gulfe of Bengala*. We know that in 1632 he was in London, for in June of that year he acted as deputy of Humphrey Leigh as swordbearer of the city of London. In the following year, 1633, he was sent by the Company to Surat in an important capacity.<sup>8</sup>

In a letter from William Methold to his wife, written from Surat, December 22, 1634, is a reference to the Mary<sup>9</sup>:

"The affections of my soule contracted into such a quintessence as might be containd in one poore letter presentes themselves unto thee in a double kopy, the one of them inclosed unto ye hon<sup>ble</sup> East India Company, the other by Mr. Barker, and yf the royall Mary<sup>10</sup> arrived in safety I make no secret [?] that bothe of them came seasonably to thy handes."

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

## THE COUNCIL OF REMIREMONT.

In the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* of 1849 (vol. VII, pp. 160-167), G. Waitz published a Latin poem of two hundred and thirty-nine hexameter verses in leonine rhyme, to which he gave the name of *Das Liebesconcil*. The manuscript which he followed seemed to belong to the eleventh or twelfth century. Many years later, in 1877, Waitz printed in the same journal (vol. XXI, pp. 65-68) some emendations to the text, which he had found in a copy made by Pertz from another manuscript. In 1880 B. Hauréau

<sup>8</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography*.

<sup>9</sup> British Museum. *Addit. MS.* 11,268.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. f. 347 of the play: "A royal shippe and heaves a royall name."

<sup>7</sup> A short selection from this play was printed by Bullen, *Old English Plays*, II, 432.

mentioned the poem—under the title of *Le Concile de Remiremont*—as an imitation of the *Altercatio Phyllidis et Floræ*, and assigned it to the fourteenth century.<sup>1</sup> In 1886 Paul Meyer expressed the opinion that it belonged to the first years of the twelfth century.<sup>2</sup> G. Gröber also pronounces in favor of the twelfth century, but without restricting the time to any part of the century.<sup>3</sup>

The *Council of Remiremont* is a very interesting specimen of mediæval Latin literature, but its date would be of little consequence were it definitely fixed in the last third of the twelfth century. In that period it would find associates, both in Latin and in the vernacular. Its presence in a fairly numerous company would not be particularly significant. On the other hand, if the *Council* was composed before the Crusade of 1147, or, as Paul Meyer would seem to believe, before Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Britonum*, its position in the literary history of the Middle Ages becomes a commanding one. We would then be compelled to agree with E. Langlois that it is the earliest example of mediæval amatory verse which has come down to us.<sup>4</sup>

Of the dates proposed for the *Council*, the one suggested by Hauréau, of the fourteenth century, is undoubtedly wrong. Pertz, and Waitz too,<sup>5</sup> can hardly have gone so far astray as to the date of the Trier manuscript. Besides, the ideas advanced by the author of the *Council* are the ideas in vogue under Louis VII and Philip Augustus. It is not probable that they were revived in this one instance under the Valois. For the other extreme, the approximate date mentioned by Paul Meyer, there are objections, if we subscribe to the accepted views of mediæval literature. The sentiments to which the poem gives expression are generally supposed to have been formulated in the courts of France, Champagne and Flanders after the contact of French nobles with Provençal culture, or during the third quarter of the twelfth century. An analysis of the *Council* shows at once how excellent a representative of romantic

literature it is, the romanticism of the Latin Renaissance :

The *Council of Remiremont* is a parody on a church council. It discloses an assembly of women, nuns, not monks, where the deliberations pertain to love, not religion. As the story goes, this council of unusual composition was held during the Ides of April at the abbey of Remiremont in the diocese of Toul. No man was allowed a seat in the assembly, but "honesti clerici" might be spectators. Old women inimical to "gaudium" were also excluded. The proceedings were opened by reading the Gospel according to Ovid, and continued by the singing of love songs. Then a "cardinalis domina" took the chair and asked for silence. She was a royal maiden, a daughter of Spring, clad in a dress of many colors hung with a thousand flowers of May. Addressing all those who gloried in love and in the amatory delights of April and May, she announced herself to be the envoy of Amor, the god of all lovers. Her mission was to visit the nuns of Remiremont and search into their lives. Therefore, all of them should confess what their manner of living was. She would correct them and be indulgent to them.

This address of the "cardinalis domina" was responded to by Elisabeth des Granges, who declared that they all served Amor, and consorted with monks only, a statement which was at once supported by Elisabeth du Faucon. The love of clerks, she said, who are affable, pleasing, honorable men, who know not desertion or slander, but who are expert in love, generous in gifts, is far preferable to the love of knights, as the nuns had found out by bitter experience. This unfavorable opinion is further upheld by Agnes. Knights' love is forbidden, illicit. Then Bertha adds her testimony to the advantage of an alliance of Amor, "juventutis gaudium," with clerks. Finally, the assembly in chorus proclaims its intention to love clerks with the consent of the "cardinalis domina," a consent at once given, for she sees no "useful" lovers save clerks.

But there are a few friends of knights present and they protest against such a verdict. They, for their part, had found the love of knights pleasing. Knights study how they may win their ladies' favors. To accomplish this result they fear

<sup>1</sup> *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits*, etc., vol. xxix, 2, p. 309.

<sup>2</sup> *Romania*, xv, p. 333.

<sup>3</sup> *Grundriss*, II, p. 421.

<sup>4</sup> *Origines et Sources du Roman de la Rose*, p. 6.

<sup>5</sup> See Pertz' *Archiv*, VIII, p. 598.

neither wounds nor death. The clerks' advocates rejoin that knights are fickle and garrulous. They betray their love affairs. Therefore, they would advise that the love of knights be condemned.

The greater number incline to this opinion, and, in obedience to the will of the majority, the "cardinalis domina" orders that nuns who love knights be refused admittance to their circle, until they repent, receive absolution and promise to sin no more. To this general decree she adds other and explicit commands, that nuns must be content with one lover only, under the penalty of the council's ban, and he should be a clerk who will not reveal their secrets. She calls on them to affirm whether or not this is their opinion. All assent, "sedens in concilio." The decree is to be published in churches and cloisters, and anathema will be pronounced on the disobedient. An "Excommunicatio rebellarum," in set terms suited to the language of Pagan mythology, ends the poem.

What light do the contents of the *Council of Remiremont* throw on its place in mediæval literature? They show that allusions to Spring, to April and May, have become conventional in lyric poetry, that "joy" (*gaudium*) in its technical sense, and "joy of youth" (*Amor, deus omnium, juventutis gaudium*, l. 101) have become acclimated in North France, and that Ovid's authority in amatory matters is unquestioned. Of these characteristics, the first marks the verses of William IX, thus dating from the first years of the twelfth century, at least. The second—"joy" in its meaning of love or as an attribute of love—is commonly held to be of Provençal origin—perhaps because of the lack of French documents—and is supposed to have entered into the phraseology of the Northern poets after the Crusade of 1147. For the third, we know that Ovid's erotic works had long been admired by Latin writers. They are cited by French and Provençal poets who wrote towards the middle of the century.<sup>6</sup> But it is doubtful whether the *Ars amatoria* would have been substituted for the Gospel (*quasi evangelium*) in the early part of the reign of Louis VII,

or whether indeed the very conception of a parody on church councils would have been tolerated in that devout period. The structure of the *Council* is really one of a debate between women on subjects pertaining to love, a kind of *cour d'amour* held in a convent. Such an idea would rather suit the years when the influence of Eleanor of Poitou and her daughters had become predominant in court circles, or the sixth and seventh decades of the twelfth century. One statement of the nuns, that clerks

Laudant nos in omnibus rithmis atque versibus (l. 146)

would, in fact, better apply to the generation following the Crusade of 1147. For lyric forms, whether in French or Latin, attained variety in North France only after the introduction of Provençal models about that time.

To these inferences in favor of a comparatively late date in the century for the composition of the *Council*, may be added a decisive argument perhaps. When the few nuns who prefer knights to clerks rally to defend their lovers, they advance the claim that in addition to their other merits knights try to win them by their exploits :

Audaces ad prelia sunt pro nostri gratia :

Ut si nos habeant, et si nobis placeant,

Nulla timent aspera, nec mortem, nec vulnera.

(ll. 116-118.)

Here we find the fundamental definition of "cortoisie." The man solicits the woman's love, not the woman the man's. And to please her he does deeds at arms, unhorses all comers at any risk. Furthermore, the passage in the *Council* shows that the idea was fully formed. The stage of its development had passed. Now the particular epoch in which this development is supposed to have taken place is the reign of Henry I of England. The customs of "courteous" society found their first eulogist in Geoffrey of Monmouth towards the end of that reign. They made their appearance in French literature with the *Roman de Thèbes*, for the early *chansons de toile* are not "cortois" in tone. There is therefore no reason to suppose that a poem hailing from Lorraine, which takes the ideal of "cortoisie" for granted, antedates the general acceptance of that ideal by the court circles of the Continent. Rather the contrary would be the case. The poet must have

<sup>6</sup>See Everard's translation of *Cato* in *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, no. 47, strophe 74;—*Richent* (ll. 746-749) in *Méon's Nouveau Recueil*;—*Uc Catola* and *Marcbraun* in *Appel's Chrestomathie*, no. 85, ll. 37-39.

addressed himself to an audience which fully admitted "cortoisie," at least in this essential respect of winning a lady's favors by deeds at arms.

Another evidence of the presence of a developed "cortois" sentiment may be seen in the commands of the "cardinalis domina" to her nuns concerning their attitude towards their suitors. She bids them keep themselves for clerks only :

Ne vos detis vilibus unquam et militibus  
Tactum vestri corporis, vel coxe, vel femoris.  
(ll. 185-186.)

Apart from the sensuality of the lines, which would point to the existence of a considerable amount of verse of the same sort, the question naturally suggests itself why "vilibus," a general term, should be used in close contrast with "militibus," the name of a particular class. An obvious answer to this question would be that "vilibus" is a synonym for "villanis," and is substituted here for "villanis" in order to satisfy the requirements of both rhyme and rhythm. Should this assumption be correct, we would then find grouped together the three classes of feudal society, which were recognized by the court poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the clerks, the knights, and the villains.

Through internal evidence we are therefore led to this conclusion: The *Council of Remiremont*, with its romantic spirit and amatory sentiment, would come later in the century than *Thèbes* or Wace's *Brut*, and probably later than the first works of Gautier d'Arras and Chrétien de Troyes. To admit that it antedates them would be to reverse the generally received opinions regarding the development of court poetry in North France. We would therefore place the *Council* not earlier than 1160, and preferably not earlier than Chrétien's *la Charrrette*. Waitz' statement regarding the date of the Trier manuscript, and Paul Meyer's belief that the *Council* is the product of the generation of Henry I argue against the validity of this conclusion. But we think that a close examination of the manuscript might extend the time limits set by Waitz, and perhaps modify Paul Meyer's attitude toward the question. If it does not, it would then be in order to change our views

regarding the rise of mediæval literature to a somewhat radical extent.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

### MILTON'S 'SPHERE OF FORTUNE.'

For him I reckon not in high estate  
Whom long descent of birth,  
Or the sphere of fortune raises.

These lines of the Chorus in *Samson Agonistes* (170-172), which seem clear enough at first, lead one on closer examination to ask what Milton meant by 'the sphere of fortune.' In ancient and mediæval tradition it was not by her sphere, but by her wheel, that Fortuna wrought vicissitude in the conditions of men.<sup>1</sup>

Praecipitem movet illam rotam, motusque laborem  
Nulla quies claudit, nec sistunt otia motum.  
Nam cum saepe manum dextram labor ille fatiget,  
Laeva manus succedit ei, fessaeque sorori  
Succurrit, motumque rotae velocius urget.  
Cujus turbo rapax, raptus celer, impetus anceps,  
Involvens homines, a lapsus turbine nullum  
Excipit, et cunctos fati ludibria ferre  
Cogit, et in varios homines descendere casus.  
Hos premit, hos relevat; hos dejicit, erigit illos.  
Summa rotae dum Croesus habet, tenet infima Codrus,  
Julius ascendit, descendit Magnus, et infra  
Sulla jacet, surgit Marius; sed cardine verso  
Sulla redit, Marius premitur; sic cuncta vicissim  
Turbo rapit, variatque vices fortuna voluntas.

On the other hand, the sphere is simply an unemployed accessory of the goddess Fortuna, or, at most, a means of locomotion; <sup>2</sup> it is 'entweder das Symbol ihres stets wandelbaren Wesens, oder drückt, wenn sie, wie z. B. auf den Wandgemälden, deutlich als Weltkugel erscheint, ihre weltherrschende Macht aus.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Tibullus 1. 5. 70; Seneca, *Agamemnon* 71; Boethius, *De Cons. Phil.* 2, Prose 2; Chaucer, *Knight's Tale* 67. The most elaborate description of her wheel is found in Alain de Lille's picture of the goddess and her abode in his allegorical poem, *Anti-Claudianus*, Bk. 8, Ch. 1 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 210. 560). [Cf. *Publ. of the M. L. A.* of A., VIII, 303 f.; *M. L. N.*, VIII, 230 f., 235 f.; IX, 95. —J. W. B.]

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Plutarch, *De Fortuna Romanorum* 4.

<sup>3</sup>Peter, in *Roscher, Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* 1. 1505.